	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/045,651	GANOT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher L. Lavin	2624	
All Participants:	Status of Application:		
(1) <u>Christopher L. Lavin</u> .	(3) <u>Kelly Hyndman (Reg</u>	. 39,234).	
(2) Michael Faibisch (Reg. 46,427).	(4)		
Date of Interview: 25 September 2006	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	cant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed:		·	
Claims discussed: Claims 16 and 17			
Prior art documents discussed: Kosmowski (5,529,441)			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN The examiner suggested that if the applicant's could overcome applicant's agreed to submit a supplemental amendment.			
Part III.		•	
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. To the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summer 	he examiner will provide a write e record of the substance of the	ten summary of the substance interview, since the interview	
	•		
	• •	•	
, <u>1</u>			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applica	(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		